



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

mz

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,330	06/23/2003	Kyung-Geun Lee	1293.1633	6586
49455	7590	05/07/2007	EXAMINER	
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP			DANIELSEN, NATHAN ANDREW	
1400 EYE STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 300			2627	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/600,330	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nathan Danielsen	2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-13,15-18 and 20-38 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-13,15-18 and 20-38 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 2627

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-18, and 20-38 are pending. Claims 3, 14, and 19 have been canceled in applicant's amendment filed 23 February 2007.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 31 January 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 2, 13, 15-18, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Regarding claims 2 and 13, it is unclear how a physical cluster is the same as any one of an ECC block, a sector, or a frame, as required by the dependencies of these claims on claims 1 and 12, respectively. Claims 15-18 and 27 are rejected as being dependent on indefinite claims.

Claims 4-7 and 28-30 are rejected because it is unclear which claim(s) they depend from since they currently depend from a canceled claim. For purposes of examination, claims 4-6, 28, and 29 will be interpreted as depending from claim 1. Additionally, if this interpretation is correct, claims 8-11 and 28 are objected to as being substantial duplicates of claims 4-7 and 25, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 16, 21, 24-29, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohno et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0024923; hereinafter Ohno), in view of Maeda (US Patent 5,337,295).

Regarding claims 1, 12, and 32, Ohno discloses an information storage medium (and corresponding methods of recording/reproducing and operating) comprising:

a user data area provided with a sequence of basic recording units to record user data (figures 1, 6, and 7),

wherein information about the user data area, where user data is recorded, is recorded in at least one of an area right before and an area right after each basic recording unit of the user data area, disposed between successive basic recording units in the user data area (figures 6 and 7), and

wherein the information about the user data area is recorded in at least one of a run-in area and a run-out area that is right before and after the basic recording unit, respectively (figure 7; where ¶ 64 suggests that the ADR and dummy blocks have the same purpose as the run-out blocks, which is to protect the user data blocks (¶ 18)).

However, Ohno fails to disclose where the basic recording unit of the user data area is a physical cluster.

In the same field of endeavor, Maeda discloses where a basic recording unit of user data is a physical cluster (figure 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the recording format of Ohno with that of Maeda, for the purpose of simplifying the data recording process (col. 9, lines 23-26).

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding claims 2 and 13, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1 and 12, respectively. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the basic recording unit of the user data area is one of an error correction code (ECC) block, a sector, and a frame (¶ 17).

Regarding claims 9, 16, and 21, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1, 12, and 13. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the information about the user data area is recorded using addresses (figures 6 and 7).

Regarding claims 24-26 and 28, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 1. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the information storage medium is one of recordable and reproduction-only optical discs (¶s 102 and 105).

Regarding claim 27, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 2. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the information about the user data area is recorded using one or more addresses of the ECC block (figure 7).

Regarding claim 29, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 2. Additionally, Ohno discloses where each of the information storage layers includes a lead-in area, a lead-out area, and the user data area (figure 1).

Regarding claims 33 and 35, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 32. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the method of claim 32 further comprises recognizing a layer of the storage medium based on the accessed information, wherein the operating of the storage medium includes recording and/or reproducing data with respect to the layer (inherent in the apparatus capable of recording on/reproducing from the single-layer recording medium of figures 1, 6, and 7; where, when reproducing information from the single layer, any successful attempt to reproduce the information cause the apparatus to recognize it as a recording layer).

Regarding claim 34, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 33. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the recognizing of the layer comprises recognizing the layer in response to the accessed information belonging to a predetermined group of addresses (inherent in the apparatus capable of recording on/reproducing from the single-layer recording medium of figures 1, 6, and 7; where, when reproducing information from the single layer, any successful attempt to reproduce

Art Unit: 2627

the information cause the apparatus to recognize it as a recording layer to which is assigned a certain range of address values).

8. Claims 4-8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 30, 31, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohno, in view of Ito et al (US Patent 5,881,032; hereinafter Ito).

Regarding claims 4-8, 10, 15, 17, 20, and 22, Ohno, in view of Maeda, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 1, 12, and 13. However, Ohno, in view of Maeda, fails to disclose where the storage medium has two layers and the details of distinguishing between them.

In the same field of endeavor, Ito discloses where the information storage medium has at least two information storage layers (figures 1D-4 and 12), and the information about the user data area is recorded in at least one of the area right before and the area right after the basic recording unit of the user data area (see claims 1, 12, and 13) in different patterns for the different information storage layers (col. 2, lines 7-8 and figure 4; where each layer has a predetermined range of addresses, where the sector addresses increase from lead-in to lead out areas on layer one and continue according to the solid black lines in the positive sector address direction, and where each address is represented on the disk by a different pattern).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the structure of the disc of Ohno to accommodate the multiple layers of Ito, for the purpose of increasing the storage capacity of the disc (col. 2, lines 17-21).

Regarding claims 11, 18, and 23, Ohno, in view of Maeda and Ito, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 10, 17, and 22, respectively. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the information about the user data area is recorded using addresses (figures 6 and 7).

Regarding claims 30 and 31, Ohno, in view of Maeda and Ito, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claims 4 and 8. However, Ohno, in view of Maeda, fails to disclose how the patterns differ between layers.

In the same field of endeavor, Ito discloses where the different patterns are one of different consecutive patterns of identical intervals and different patterns of different sized intervals (col. 2, lines 6-

Art Unit: 2627

11 and figure 11; where each address is represented on the disk by a different pattern of different sized intervals).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the format and structure of the disc of Ohno with that of Ito, for the purpose of determining which layer is to be recorded on/reproduced from (col. 4, line 58 through col. 5, line 2).

Regarding claim 36, Ohno, in view of Maeda and Ito, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 35. However, Ohno, in view of Maeda, fails to disclose how to discriminate between multiple recording layers.

In the same field of endeavor, Ito discloses where the identifying of the desired layer comprises:

recognizing a storage layer of the storage medium as the desired layer in response to the

accessed information belonging to a predetermined range (inherent in the different range of addresses assigned to each layer, as illustrated by figures 3 and 4); and

in response to the accessed information not belonging to the predetermined range, accessing

another storage layer of the storage medium so as to determine whether accessed

information thereof belongs to the predetermined range (col. 16, line 30 through col. 17, line 4 and figure 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the format and structure of the disc of Ohno with that of Ito, for the purpose of determining which layer is to be recorded on/reproduced from (col. 4, line 58 through col. 5, line 2).

Regarding claim 37, Ohno, in view of Maeda and Ito, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 36. Additionally, Ohno discloses where the operating of the storage medium includes recording and/or reproducing data with respect to the desired layer (inherent in a reproducing device).

Regarding claim 38, Ohno, in view of Maeda and Ito, discloses everything claimed, as applied to claim 35. However, Ohno, in view of Maeda, fails to disclose how to discriminate between multiple recording layers.

In the same field of endeavor, Ito discloses where the method of claim 32 further comprises identifying storage layers of the storage medium, wherein the identifying of the storage layers comprises:

Art Unit: 2627

recognizing a first layer of the storage layers in response to the accessed information belonging to a first predetermined range (col. 16, line 30 through col. 17, line 4 and figure 8);
in response to the accessed information not belonging to the first predetermined range, accessing a second layer of the storage layers so as to determine whether accessed information thereof belongs to a second predetermined range (col. 16, line 30 through col. 17, line 4 and figure 8);
recognizing the second layer of the storage layers in response to accessed information thereof belonging to the second predetermined range (col. 16, line 30 through col. 17, line 4 and figure 8); and
in response to the accessed information of the second layer not belonging to the second predetermined range, accessing another layer of the storage layers so as to determine whether accessed information thereof belongs to the second predetermined range (col. 16, line 30 through col. 17, line 4 and figure 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the format and structure of the disc of Ohno with that of Ito, for the purpose of determining which layer is to be recorded on/reproduced from (col. 4, line 58 through col. 5, line 2).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12, and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Closing Remarks!Comments

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Danielsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4248. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM Eastern Time.

Art Unit: 2627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nathan Danielsen
05/02/2007

William Korzuch
WILLIAM KORZUCH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600